CRITICISM AND THE RIGHT OF CRITICISM

A letter to a pious friend

Muhtaram,

Assalamualaykum

As have high regard for Maulana Sayyid Abul Aa'la Maududi this question may be surprising and shocking to you: why are the respected elders of the Ummah up in arms against Janab Maulana Sayyid Abul Aa'la Maududi and his `Islaamic Movement'. I ask you why did the Ummah oppose Sir Sayyid Ahmed Kahn's `Islah Islaam' Movement', Abdullah Chackralwi's `Qur'anic Movement':, Ghulam Ahmed Qadiani's ' Revival of Islaam Movement', Ghulam Ahmed Parvez's `Tulu Islaam' movement, Dr. Fazlurrahman's 'Renewal of Islaam Movement' and the 'Progressive Islaam Movement of the Socialists' ?

In answer you will say that each of these, according to their cognizance, formulated a blueprint in their minds and made this their fundamental criterion and foundation. Thereafter, whatever suited and met their standards from the Islaam of Muhammad (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam), was incorporated into it, and whatever was unsuitable or against their

technique of thinking was either abused, ridiculed, jeered, made a joke of and explained away, or, far-fetched meanings and interpretations were given so that the original meanings were obliterated. Obviously their thoughts, senses, feelings and hearts were not subordinate to Islaam, but rather the acceptance or rejection of the tenets of `Islaam' was at the mercy of their set standards. It was incumbent upon the Ulama to cleave apart this `Islaamic Talisman' and deliver forward the original Islaam of Muhammad (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam), which has been preserved for the last fourteen hundred years in people's hearts and books; and alert the people against this new calamity of `Islaamic Thinkers'. You know that the Ulama of this Ummah have carried out their duties whilst irrespective of any obstacles. They have been sworn at; they have been painted with all types of labels; they have been ridiculed; they have been penetrated with the arrows of accusations; but they (the Ulama) had to carry out their duty, and have verily tried to do so. As long as they have life and the power of speech in them, it must not be anticipated that they will abstain from committing the `offence' of calling a spade a spade or day a day, and night a night.

Now listen! In the identical manner Janab Maududi Saheb conceived and created a blueprint, which he presented as the `Islaamic Movement', and on which foundation the `Jamaat Islaami' came into existence. Today his `Jamaat Islaami' has an imprint on the big and small. Allaah forbid, my intention is

not to convey , that the law that applied to the previously mentioned individuals also applies to Janab Maududi, as there is a difference in rank and grade. The reason for giving the example of `Layer upon layer of darkness' is only to stress that these people fail to understand the True Islaam.

They are unanimous in creating a new path and a new map for Islaam. It is a different variable that paths of some are totally different from the teachings of Muhammad (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam), whilst some have a few differences. What doubt is there in this that all of them have, through the medium of their understanding and thinking,put out `their Islaam' to the masses. They have proclaimed it to be the truth and have invited the people towards it.

There is a proverb in Arabic:

> ***"For everything that fails, there is one who will find it".***

Everyone surely finds someone with whom one shares common ideas and thoughts. This is a brief answer to your question. But I feel this will not satisfy you, hence I will have to elaborate on it.In today's discussion, I invited you to think and ponder on one point only. You must have read in the constitution of the Jamaat Islaami this sentence from the pen of Janab Maududi Saheb:

> ***"No human should be made a `Measure of Truth' besides Rasulullaah (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam), no one should be regarded as free from `criticism', of anyone. As Allaah has shown, everyone should examine and inspect with a complete standard , whatever grade befits a person,and that person should be regarded as such".***
>
> **Maududi Mazhab, Page 53.**

(This constitutional belief), Janab Maududi Saheb has induced this constitutional belief in every member of the `Jamaat', whatever position one holds, not to think that any human is above criticism besides Rasulullaah (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam), nor should one fall under the sway of another's `mental slavery', and with the examining powers that Allaah Ta'ala has given Maududi Saheb and his `Jamaat', everyone should be pecked at and examined. After this examination, whatever grade one attains should be conferred on that person. Now let us read from the `Maududi Mazhab' and see , how Maududi has peeled and skinned the Salaf ,pious predecessors in his criticism. Listen, Maududi Saheb says that:

1. **The example of Moosa (Alaihis-Salaam), is of that hasty victorious commander, who marches forward without strengthening and stabilising his authority, and behind him mutiny spreads in the conquered lands like wild fire in a jungle.**

   Maududi Mazhab, page 23

***** **N.B.** **`Maududi Mazhab' is written by Maulana Qazi Mazhar Hussain Saheb. If you have any complaint or doubt regarding it you may refer it to the author. If the reader so desires I am prepared to accept this burden instead.**

2. **The danger of the highway robbery of a mischievous soul also confronts the Ambiyaa. An illustrious prophet like Dawood (Alaihis-Salaam), was**

warned on an occasion that:

"....... and follow not desire that beguile thee from the way of Allaah"

Surah Saad : 27, Ibid page 21

3. **Dawood (Alaihis-Salaam) became influenced with the customs of the Israeli society of his time and requested Orya to grant a divorce.**

Ibid page 24

4. **Dawood (Alaihis-Salaam) had a speck of carnal desire in his deeds.**

Ibid page 25

5. **Human weaknesses overcame Nuh (Alaihis-Salaam), and he became a prey to the passion of Jahiliyyah.**

Ibid page 26

6. **Actually Ismat (Chastity) is not a requisite with the soul of the Ambiyaa. This is a Lateef (delicate) point.Allaah Ta'ala had intentionally lifted His protection at some time or the other from every Nabi, so that one or two transgressions are committed, hence the people may not regard the Ambiyaa as Gods, and will know that they are human too.**

Ibid page 30

7. **The Ambiyaa transgress too,and they are even punished.**

Ibid page 31

8. **Yunus (Alaihis-Salaam) committed a few deficiencies in the fulfilling of the Faraa'id of Risalat and probably became impatient and left his position before time.**

Ibid page 35

9. **The Sahaabah were at times overcome with human shortcomings; they reviled one another.**

10 **Many a time the Sahabah Kiraam erred in understanding the original spirit of Jihaad fi Sabilillah.**

Ibid page 59

11. **Once a humble person like (Abu Bakr) Siddique Akbar Radhailaahu anhu who was immersed in Lillahiyyat,the way of Allaah blundered in fulfilling a delicate demand of Islaam.**

Ibid page 60

12. **Personal greatness overcame and made Umar (Radhaillahu-anhu) helpless for a few moments at the time of the demise of Rasulullaah (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam).**

Ibid page 60

13. **Hadhrat Uthman, on whom the burden of this great duty of Khilafat was placed, did not possess the qualifications that were granted to his noble predecessors. Therefore, Jahiliyyah found an inlet to creep into the social code.**

Ibid page 65

14. **The verdicts of the Khulafaa Raashideen, which they issued as Qadis, did not become law in Islaam.**

Ibid page 66

15. **Hadhrat Uthman Radhailaahu anhu appointed his relatives one after the other to high posts, and gave them other such concessions which generally became a source of criticism among the people.**

Ibid page 71

16. **For example he bequeathed on Marwan one fifth (5 lakh dinars) from the booty of Africa.**

Ibid page 71

17. **History reveals, and it truly shows, that Marwan and Yazeed are despised personalities among the Muslim Ummah. These are the softest words that could be said regarding Marwan and Yazeed.**

Faraan monthly September 1976, page 42

18. **These policies of Uthman (Radhaillahu-anhu) are without doubt erroneous. A wrong will remain a wrong, irrespective of who commits it. To try and prove it correct by oratory or fabrications is not the demand of logic and justice, nor is it the requirement of the Deen, that an error of a Sahaabi should not be called an error.**

Maududi Mazhab, page 73

19 **One very despicable Bid'ah began during the reign of Hadhrat Muawiya (Radhaillahu-anhu) that he himself, and by his orders all his governors, while delivering Khutbas on the mimbars reviled Hadhrat Ali (Radhaillahu-anhu). To revile and swear a person after his demise, forget the Shari'ah, it is against human etiquette, and especially to soil the Jum'ah Khutbah with such filth is a very debased act according to the Deen and to etiquette.**

Ibid page 75

20. **The effect of joining together, Isitilhaaq Ziyaad bin Sumayyah are also among those acts of Hadhrat Muawiya (Radhaillahu-anhu), wherein because of political reasons he contravened an accepted law of the Shari'ah.**

Ibid page 76

21. **Hadhrat Muawiya (Radhaillahu-anhu), in trying to make him (Ziyaad) his supporter and helper took evidence on the adultery of his father (Abu**

Sufyaan Radhailaahu anhu), and after concluding proof thereof, made Ziyaad his (Abu Sufyaan Radhailaahu anhu's) illegitimate son, and on that source made him his brother and a member of the family. This act in whatever manner it may be despised morally, is evident. According to law too this is an illicit thing. In the Shari'ah paternity is not proven from adultery.

Ibid page 77

22. **Amr bin Al'aas Radhailaahu anhu committed two such acts that there is no way out but to call it wrong.**

Ibid page 84

23. **Hadhrat Ali Radhailaahu anhu appointed Malik bin Haarith Radhailaahu anhu and Muhammad bin Abu Bakr Radhailaahu anhu as governors, whereas, these two people had a hand in the murder of Uthman (Radhaillahu-anhu). This is known to everybody. During the entire reign of Ali (Radhaillahu-anhu), this is the only deed it seems cannot be called anything else but wrong.**

Ibid page 85

24. **Hadhrat Ae'isha (Radhaillahu-anhu) and Hafsah (Radhaillahu-anhu) became bold, and began to `stretch their tongues' in the presence of Rasulullaah (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam).**

Ibid page 88

25. **After studying history it is found that till now no thorough Mujaddid is born. It was a near thing that Umar bin Abdulaziz Radhailaahu anhu attained that position, but he was not successful.**

Ibid page 91

26. **In the reviews of Imaam Ghazali there are a few Ilmi and Fikri flaws, and that may be divided into three portions. One type are those flaws that were as a result of his poor knowledge of Hadith. The second type are due to the Aqliyyah overpowering his mind. And the third type of flaws are due to his leaning towards Tasawwuf more than that which was necessary.**

Ibid page 92

27. **The first thing that rattles in me regarding the revival mission from the time of Hadhrat Mujaddid Alf Thaani Radhailaahu anhu to the time of Shah (Waliyullah) SahebRadhailaahu anhu and his disciples is this that in Tasawwuf they did not estimate the illness of the Muslims. They prescribed for them the same food from which they should have completely kept away.**

Ibid page 92

28. **Neither Hadhrat Mujaddid Saheb, nor Shah (Waliyullah) Saheb was unaware of this `Illness'. Criticism regarding this is found in the writings of both. It is possible that they did not truly estimate the seriousness of this `disease'. For this reason these two venerable personalities gave those sick people the same food, which had proven to be fatal. The outcome of this was that gradually both circles became influenced by the same disease.**

Ibid page 94

29. **Although Maulana Ismail Shaheed Radhailaahu anhu understood this reality well and adopted the same course as that of Ibn Taymiyyah Radhailaahu anhu but, as this was present in the literature of Shah Waliyullah Saheb, the effect of which remained in the writings of Shah Ismail**

Shaheed R. Alayhi, the chain of Peeri Mureedi continued in the movement of Sayyid Saheb. Therefore, this movement could not be free from the germs of the `disease of sufiyyat'.

Ibid page 95

30. **And we note this `Jahalah', with the exception of a very small Jamaat, among the general Muslims from East to West, be they from the illiterate public, or graduate Ulama, or mendicant Mashaa'ikh, or graduates of colleagues and universities. The thoughts, ways and manners of all these are different, but they are unanimous in not knowing the truth and soul of Islaam.**

Ibid page 19

I have presented a few drops from the enraged ocean of Janab Maududi Saheb's criticism. All this, according to his own attestation, is written after examining by the `standards' shown by Allaah. I do not wish to discuss or debate each point. Think for yourself that after all these criticisms what picture is formed of Islaam in the mind. Nevertheless, I feel that for your convenience a few basic points should be presented:

1. **The instruction of Janab Maududi Saheb that `besides Rasulullaah (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam) no human is above Tanqeed i.e. Criticism. Before thinking of its outcome first ponder that what is Tanqeed ,Criticism? (The Oxford Dictionary says criticism is judging of merit, animadversion; critical observation). Tanqeed is an Arabic word which means to gauge, assay, examine, inspect, test and to ascertain the truth from untruth. In the Urdu usage it means to be captious, seize on trifling faults, reveal shortcomings, i.e. Tanqeed will mean that after examining a thing, en error is ascertained, then its weak points are proclaimed. When we say that a certain person criticised someone then nothing else will be understood besides that the weak points of the person criticised are brought to light. That person was examined and all faults and shortcomings were revealed.**

2. **Whatever thing or person that is the centre of criticism. The first picture that comes to mind regarding that thing is the centre of criticism is that it or that person needs examining. Only after an examination could it be ascertained whether this thing or person is reliable, because that which is a hundred percent reliable does not necessitate an examination. I am sure you have not yet seen a wise person in this world who goes around examining reliable things. It is an accepted fact that there is no necessity to test or inspect reliable things or personalities. These things that are worthy of criticism are not reliable. For example, regarding weights and measures that are stamped by the government standard authority and used in commerce, one will not find people asking : "Sahib, are these measures and weights correct or not?" After being checked and stamped by the government these weights and measures are above criticism and do not need any further examination.**

   Now when Maududi Saheb tells us that no human besides Rasulullaah (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam) is above criticism then nothing else is meant but that except Rasulullaah (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam) no human is reliable before us. Janab Maududi Saheb labels this reliability as `mental slavery', and that none should be influenced by the `mental slavery' of any human besides that of Rasulullaah (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam).

   For this reason, according to his own picture of Islaam, he has not granted the verdicts of the Khulafaa Raashideen as legally lawful whereas Rasulullaah (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam) has in no uncertain terms advised his Ummah to strongly hold onto the Sunnahs of the Khulafaa Raashideen. You must have read this Hadith in the Mishkaat Shareef:

   "Irbaad bin Saariyah (Radhaillahu-anhu), reports: `Rasulullaah (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam), after leading the Salaah, turned his face

towards us, and delivered a very inspiring lecture, (as a result of which) tears flowed from the eyes, and hearts were moved'. (Thereafter) a person said: `Oh Rasul of Allaah, this was like a farewell lecture, please advise us'. He said: `I advise you to fear Allaah, and hear and accept (your leaders), even if he be a Habshi slave, because the one among you who will live after me, shall witness many discords. It is incumbent on you (to hold fast) onto my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the Guided Khulafaa Raashideen. Hold fast unto it, and keep it tight with the teeth. Beware and stay away from new (modern) ideas and acts. For every new act (that is thought to be part of religion) is Bid'ah, and every Bid'ah (leads) astray".

Musnad Ahmed, Abu Dawood, Tirmizi,
Ibn Majah, Mishkaat page 29

3. Do you know what is meant when one criticises another? Listen, if the knowledge of a person is criticised, even if it is regarding one Mas'alah or an affair, it will mean that in the Mas'alah that the person's view is incorrect, or the knowledge of the criticizer is superior and it will mean the criticizer's understanding is superior. If the deeds of the person are attacked, it will mean that the deeds of the criticizer are of a higher standard. In short, for whatever reason the next person is criticised, it will mean that the knowledge, deeds, intelligence and understanding of the criticizer are superior. At times the criticizer is truly better than the one criticised, and at times it is the opposite, but the criticised, because of his vanity and self-aggrandizement regards himself to be superior. In Islaam this is called `Kibr' or `Takabbur'. This is the same `Kibr' which overtook Iblis, and through this wrong self aggrandizement, instead of being a `Mu'allim Malakut', he was cursed till the day of Qiyaamah. Now put these USUL, principles before you, and ponder over the criticism, and Usul of Maududi Saheb's criticism. He gives every Tom, Dick and Harry the right to criticise everybody except Rasulullaah (SAW) from among the Salaf Saaliheen. You tell me what should this be called? Does every member of Maududi's Jamaat have better knowledge and understanding than the Salaf Saaliheen? If not, then what else can his motive be besides self-conceited imaginations and notions? When Maududi Saheb says that Yunus (Alais Salaam) committed a few errors in fulfilling the Risalat his claim is tantamount to that he understood at the time of his writing the responsibilities of the Risalat more than Yunus (Alais Salaam) and possibly (Na Uzubillah) more than Allaah, because the least, that is expected from Maududi Saheb is that he will not confer an important post in his Jamaat to someone that he knows will not diligently carry out the duties. But according to Maududi Saheb Allaah Ta'ala conferred the Risalat on Yunus (Alais Salaam) and did not take this precaution. In like manner when he says that the passion of Jahiliyyah overcame Yunus (Alais Salaam) then it is, as if he is claiming that his foresight on the passions of Jahiliyyah is greater than that of Yunus (Alais Salaam) and that he has the strength to withstand the passions of Jahiliyyah. He says regarding himself;

"It is Allaah's Fadhl that I did not commit any deed or say any word under the influence of my passions, nor did I commit it. Every word that I uttered in my lectures, I measured each one of them before saying them, remembering that I would have to account for it before Allaah and the creation. Therefore, I am assured in my position that I did not utter a word against Haq".

Maududi Mazhab, page 29

When he says that Dawood (Alais Salaam) was influenced by the customs of the Israeli society and committed certain acts, he forgets that the one that is captivated by the `mental slavery' of one's society can never be a Nabi. With all this it gives one the impression that if Hadhrat Maulana Sayyid Abul Aa'la Maududi was in the place of Dawood (Alais Salaam), he would never have asked Orya to divorce his wife.

When he says that in certain matters Hadhrat Muawiya (Radhaillahu-anhu) did not even take into consideration human morals, at that time he thinks of himself as a greater Aalim in human morality that Muawiya (Radhaillahu-anhu). When he says that Muawiya (Radhaillahu-anhu) openly disobeyed a certain fundamental of the Shari'ah at that time he presents himself as a greater Aalim of Shari'ah than Muawiya (Radhaillahu-anhu).

When he says that from the time of Umar bin Abdulaziz (Radhaillahu-anhu) till that time of Sayyid Ahmed Shahid R. Alayhi there was a shortcoming in the Tajdeedi missions of all the Mujaddids, at that time he tries to make believe that he understands Tajdeed and the revival of the Deen more than all these pious elders. And when he very proudly claim this:

> ***"Instead of understanding the Deen from the present or previous personalities, I have always tried to understand it from the Qur'an and Sunnah.* Therefore, always when trying to know what the Deen of Allaah wants from me and every Mu'min.* I never try to see what certain Buzrugs have said, but rather, I try to see what the Qur'an says and what the Rasul says.*****
>
> **Maududi Mazhab, page 98**

He is actually trying to show to the people that in the long history of the Ummah there was not born anyone besides himself who understands the Deen. Well, this is a different subject on which Insha'Allaah, when the time permits, I will say something. Briefly, I would say this, that the motive of criticism is always that one feels `Ana

---

*** Who taught you the Qur'an and Sunnah? People of the present or the past? The angles of the Mala Aalaa? or like Ghulam Ahmed Qadiani, he came with it from the stomach of his mother? It is the height of ungratefulness. Those through the Barakah of whom a few correct or incorrect words were learnt, are being rejected and discarded.**

**** Fundamentally, these are the same viewpoints of Mirza Ghulam Ahmed Qadiani and Ghulum Ahmed Parwez.**

khayrum minhu' (I am better than him). If one is really superior to another in knowledge, understanding, deeds and morals, then verily one has the right to criticise another who has a lower standard. If of his own accord feels superior, and if this is his motive, then every Mu'min should beseech Allaah for His protection. Now in reality if Janab Maududi Saheb is superior in knowledge understanding, deeds, Taqwa than those whom he has criticised, then, without doubt he has the right to criticise them. But, if in comparison to these personalities, he really is lower, and has the urge to criticise, then what can his motive be besides high-mindedness, arrogance, self-conceit and Takabbur?

4. According to the viewpoint of Janab Maududi Saheb, when no individual of the 1400 year old Ummah is above criticism, nor can anyone be relied upon, and according to the standards shown by Allaah, it is incumbent to examine every person, then this question arises that could the Deen that has reached the Ummah of today through the Naql, Riwaayah, knowledge and deeds of the Salaf Saaliheent be relied upon? Do you know that the proofs and arguments of our Deen are taken from four sources ?

a. The Kitaab of Allaah;

b. The Sunnah of Rasulullaah (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam), (Wherein is included the Sunnahs of the Khulafaa Raashideen);
c. The Ijmaa of the Ummah;
d. and the Qiyass of the Mujtahideen.

The Fiqhi Masaa'il of the A'immah Mujtahideen have been abrogated in such a manner that, Mashaa'Allaah, Maududi himself is a Mujtahid Mutlaq. He is not in need of benefitting from any present or past tutor to understand the Deen. When the whole Ummah is in need of a critical examination and are thought to be unreliable, then it is clear that Ijmaa will be of no value. The dependence of the Kitaab and sunnah are on Riwaayat and Diraayat especially when, according to the research of Janab Maududi Saheb, the Sahaabah Kiraam (Radhaillahu-anhu), attacked one another and (Na Uzubillah) called one another liars. If in reality, Na Uzubillah, the Sahaabah Kiraam (Radhaillahu-anhu) were as pictured by the criticism of Maududi Saheb then it is evident that the Ummah that will come after this will be even worse. The result will be that beginning from the Qur'an and Hadith till the Ijmaa and Qiyaas everything will be doubtful and will be regarded as unreliable, until Maududi Saheb will show us through the standards shown to him by Allaah that how reliable a certain thing is and how unreliable others are. In all fairness please tell us what else besides this did Mirza Ghulam Ahmed Qadiani and Mr Ghulam Ahmed Parvez say? Where did Maududi Saheb attain this `Allaah Standard' in the light of which every individual from the Salaf Saaliheen have been examined and graded? What! Will Wahi again be revealed to him or will he leap back fourteen hundred years and personally hear the Qur'an and Sunnah from Rasulullaah (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam)? When he does not accept the connections of any personality of the past or present nor is he prepared to shoulder the `mental slavery' of anyone then from which cave will he receive the `Standards of Allaah'?

5. You may also know that Allaah Ta'ala has taken it upon Himself to safeguard this last Deen of ours till the Day of Qiyaamah. The Deen can only be safeguarded when the words of the Nusus of the Deen are preserved without any changes. Its meanings are also preserved. Then the manner in which Rasulullaah (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam) had practised and demonstrated it himself and how the Sahaabah Kiraam (Radhaillahu-anhuma) practised these in his presence should also be preserved. Then through these deeds the proficiency in Islaamic thought and pleasure, the path of Ihsaan and the understanding of the Deen that is created should also remain preserved. Briefly, four things are mentioned here: words, meanings, deeds and Islaamic thought. We, who are engrossed in `mental slavery', do not think but it is our belief that Allaah Ta'ala has without any break or interruption preserved these four things, and we are indebted to those through whom these were preserved. They are our guides and leaders. We have complete reliance on them. We are their `mental slaves' and we are thankful for their kindness and benevolence. If, hypothetically, these great personalities are removed from in between and it is thought that in a certain period the words, meanings, deeds and Islaamic thought could not have been preserved, or it could not be relied upon, then, because of this, the entire structure of the Deen is being put into a negative light. But, according to the viewpoint of Maududi Saheb, not one of the four things mentioned remains credible because the disgrace of being `mentally enslaved' to the personalities of the past or present periods is totally unacceptable in his lofty court, nor will he accept any of it. Even if we give him the benefit of the doubt that the words of the Qur'an and Sunnah are preserved, then too the stages of interpreting the words and giving them their proper meanings and through practising them for one to reach the stages of Islaamic thoughts will yet have to be covered. Since Maududi Saheb does not accept their `mental slavery' of any human he will have to traverse this whole path on his own and in the same manner he will also have to cover the path through his own intellect and understanding. The result that will ensue and the picture that one will form of the Deen needs no comments. It is

a fact that a person who wants to remain in the Deen of Muhammad (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam) will have to become a `mental slave' of those Salaf Saaliheen who had upheld the Deen. The person that cannot withstand this `disgrace' or does not want to follow it cannot attain true Islaam ,The Islaam brought by Muhammad (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam), even if one reaches the highest positions. After refuting the reliability of the sayings and conditions of the Salaf Saaliheen and not becoming engrossed in their `mental slavery', if Janab Maududi Saheb has invented some scientific way we will look forward to know about it, on condition that it is a bit different from the styles and modes of Mr Parvez and Mirza Qadiani.

6. **I Accept that Janab Maududi Saheb is a good author and has a flowing pen but I feel that he in his lofty thoughts sometimes uses such words that according to the situation are utterly out of context. For example, take the words `above criticism' and `mental slavery'.These, according to their coherence, are meaningless. Ponder that `mental slavery' is not a shortcoming in the Islaamic religion but is a thing to be proud of a thousand times then should one not be proud of following the path of the Salaf Saaliheen and those who have shouldered the burden of Islaam? What shall be the meaning of this saying of Rasulullaah (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam): `That my Ummah will never unite on falsehood'.**

   Picture a child who went to Madrasah or school for the first time. The Ustaaz began teaching him the alphabets, and taught him that this is `Alif' and that is `Ba'. In reply the pupil says: `Sir, I am a thinker of the fourteen century, or nineteen century A.D., why should I accept your `mental slavery'? It is apparent what type of education this `thinker' will attain. We do not even hold this position in relation to the Sahaabah and Salaf Saaliheen as the relation of the modern `thinker' had with his Ustaaz. We learned the rudiments of Deen from these noble personalities. The result of the revolt against conforming to their `mental slavery' is not different from that pupil who claimed to be a `thinker'. May Allaah forgive me. I am of the opinion that those who severe their links from the Salaf Saaliheen, that throw off the yolk of their `mental slavery', and are trying to map out a new path of Islaam, in essence do not acknowledge Islaam, but repeatedly use the words of the Qur'an and Sunnah, because there is no other way to spread their Kufr and disbelief among the Muslim public. I do not regard Janab Maududi Saheb amongst them but it is regretted that he has, by rejecting the 'mental slavery' of every personality among the Salaf Saaliheen, given preference to the `mental slavery' of the orientalist western disbelievers, and he has adopted the mentality of the 'free-thinkers' after whom the modernist of today are running.

7. **Janab Maududi Saheb has satirized and ridiculed the following of the path of Salaf Saaliheen as `mental slavery', whereas, this is the same `mental slavery' which the Qur'an Kareem proclaims as `Sabilul Mu'mineen',a way for the believers and has warned those who disregard it of a severe punishment in Jahannam. This is the same `mental slavery' that their Qur'an describes as `As Siraatal Mustaqeem',the straight path, and instructs one to supplicate to its guidance. Also, this is the same 'mental slavery' for which the Muslims rub their noses five times a day to make du'aa. What a bad and distasteful interpretation this is, that the path on which countless caravans of pious people have trodden, the following of which is today labelled as `mental slavery'.**

   If you have studied the emergence of all the false sects during the Islaamic period then this truth will dawn upon you that the foundations of all these sects are on `Ana wala ghayri'-me and no one besides me. All these have felt ashamed of the `mental slavery' of the Salaf Saaliheen and have floated their lofty thoughts in the jungles of their one intelligence and understanding. Thereafter, whichever way their heads rose their thoughts began to float in that way.

The first fitnah in Islaam was introduced by Abdullah bin Saba, a Jew, whose basic thinking was founded on the pretence that no one is above criticism besides the noble personality of Rasulullaah (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam). Then from the stomach of this Saba'iyyah the fitnah of the Khawaarij was born which exclaimed aloud that Ali (Radhaillahu-anhu) and the other Sahaabah did not understand Islaam. "We understand more than them". Then on the same basis the sects of Mu'tazilah, Mufjiyah, Qadriyyah and others took root. Each one of them portrayed the following of the Salaf as `mental slavery'. They went astray and led others astray. In our modern times you will find that the new sects that emerge, although their basis and viewpoints differ, are more or less unanimous on the above point. It is fashionable today to satirize the Salaf Saaliheen: extract worms from their deeds: injure their personalities; shoot arrows of criticism at them: and label their following as revisionism, out moded, obsolete, orthodoxy, mental slavery and so on. It is sad that Janab Maududi Saheb has also based his `Islaamic Movement' on these lines. When we read the history of the Khawaarij we were surprised at their boldness. They claimed to understand the Deen more than such a personality who has seen with his open eyes the Sun of Islaam rise, and who has been an associate and confidant of Rasulullaah (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam) during his 23 year period of Nabuwwat: who had eye-witnessed every incident of the Nazili Wahi: who had spent his whole life from childhood to old age in the service of Islaam. We fail to understand what has happened to their senses? They vehemently criticise his religious understanding. History repeats itself.

Today the criticisms of Janab Maududi Saheb, his attack on Uthman (Radhaillahu-anhu) and other Sahaabah, has removed our astonishment and surprise regarding the Khaarihjis. Maududi Saheb tries to make us understand that Uthman (Radhaillahu-anhu) was not able to upkeep the `Islaamic System,' nor did anyone after him have the guidance and power to do so. Now Janab Maududi Saheb's `Islaamic Movement: which verily is a new Khaarij order, will spread the Islaamic System. Whereas the angels of Allaah are modest in the presence of Uthman (Radhaillahu-anhu).

Rasulullaah (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam) says:

"Should I not feel modest before that person, in the presence of whom the Malaa'ikah feel modest"

Muslim, Mishkat, page 561.

Maududi Saheb does not feel a jerk by this but showers licentious criticism on him. Rasulullaah (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam) in recognising the great sacrifice of Uthman (Radhaillahu-anhu) says:

"Whatever Uthman (Radhaillahu-anhu) does after this, there shall be no accusation upon him".

Tirmizi, Mishkat

But Maududi Saheb feels it an honour to heap accusations on him. Rasulullaah (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam) advises the Ummah:

"Fear Allaah regarding my Sahabaah (companions), Fear Allaah regarding my Sahaabah. do not make them a source of criticism after me. That person who has loved them, has loved them because they love me, and those who hate them, have hated them because they hate me".

Tirmizi

But Maududi Saheb deems it important to criticise them by sifting them all through a sieve. It grants every Tom, Dick and Harry the right to criticise. By criticising them he instructs the Ummah to despise and hate them, so that people may keep away from becoming their `mental salves'. This is the same Kahaarijiyyah in a new colour, which surfaced during the time of the Sahaabah. It is stated in the Hadith that the `Later one's among this Ummah will curse its forbearers'.

I end this letter, by mentioning the command of the Faqihul Ummah, Abdullah bin Mas'ud (Radhaillahu-anhu). You may compare the `standard of truth' between that of the great Sahaabi and that of Maududi Saheb.

He says:

"If you wish to follow anyone, then follow the path of those who have passed away, because one is not safe from the fitnah of a living person. I mean those who are among the Sahaabah of Muhammad (SallAllaahu alayhi wasallam). They were the best among this Ummah; they possessed the clearest of hearts; they attained the deepest of knowledge; and had the least formalities. Allaah Ta'ala had chosen them as companions of his Nabi and to upkeep His Deen. Therefore, recognise their virtues, and follow their footsteps. As far as possible hold fast unto their characters and qualities, because they are on the straight path". **Razeen**

May Allaah Ta'ala give us, the entire Ummah, the Taufeeq of following this golden advice, and keep us on the straight path.

Aameen

Muhammad Yusuf Ludhianwi

A LITERAL TRANSLATION OF A LETTER TITLES `TANQEED AUR HAQQE TANQEED'. BAYYINAAT, KARACHI ZULHIJJAH 1396. Hijri.